UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/762,559	01/23/2004	Katsunori Takada	K06-165935M/TBS	3219	
21254 7590 07/18/2007 MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC 8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD			EXAMINER		
			MCNELIS, KATHLEEN A		
SUITE 200 VIENNA, VA	22182-3817		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			1742		
		,	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/762,559	TAKADA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Kathleen A. McNelis	1742

	Kathleen A. McNelis	1742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 09 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)		
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date	•		•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final reject	ion.		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Off	riate extension fee ice action; or (2) as		
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complising the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the			
AMENDMENTS	had a single to the data of filling a bailet	will not be entered b			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further common terms. 			ecause		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		TE Delow),			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for		
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	jected claims.	-		
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	•		•		
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of		
Claim(s) allowed:			·.		
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).		
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	•		nce because:		
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).				
		•			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitation "wherein the steel is devoid of Cr, Cu, Ni and Al" added to claims 1, 5 and 9 was not recited in the finally rejected claims and therefore raises new issues that will require additional consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Although applicant argues that the additional limitation "wherein the steel is devoid of Cr, Cu, Ni and Al" does not raise new issues, examiner does not agree. The finally rejected independent claims 1, 5 and 9 used opened "comprising" language to recite compositions and therefore did not exclude the elements Cr, Cu, Ni and Al. Further, depending claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-12 recite composition ranges encompassing above-zero amounts of Cr, Cu, Ni and Al. Finally, although depending claim 20 recites "wherein the steel comprises a material other than Cr, Cu, Ni and Al", this is not the same as the limitation "wherein the steel is devoid of Cr, Cu, Ni and Al".

Applicant argues that examiner cites Steel 7 in Table 1 of Iguchi as a steel devoid of Cr, Cu, Ni and AI, however this limitation was not recited in the finally rejected claims. Examiner ctied Steel 7 of Table 1 as meeting the limitations of the finally rejected claims as they were recited at the time the rejection was made (see 03/08/2007 Office action).

07/13/2007

HOY KING SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700